

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RANDOLPH L. MOORE,
Petitioner,
v.

WILLIAM GITTERE, *et al.*,
Respondents.

Case No. 2:13-cv-0655-JCM-DJA

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
(ECF NO. 150)

In this capital habeas corpus action, after a 120-day initial period, a 62-day extension of time, and two 30-day extensions of time, the respondents were due to file an answer by December 10, 2021. See Order entered April 12, 2021 (ECF No. 143) (120 days for answer); Order entered August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 145) (62-day extension of time); Order entered November 1, 2021 (ECF No. 147) (30-day extension of time); Order entered November 8, 2021 (ECF No. 149) (30-day extension of time).

On December 10, 2021, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 150), requesting a further 60-day extension of time, to February 8, 2022. Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time is necessary because of his obligations in other cases. Petitioner does not oppose the motion for extension of time.

The Court finds that Respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the requested extension of time.

///

///

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **Petitioner will have 120 days to file a reply to Respondents' answer**; in all other respects, the schedule for further proceedings set forth in the February 5, 2019, scheduling order (ECF No. 51), will remain in effect.

James C. Mahan
JAMES C. MAHAN,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE